

**S-E-C-R-E-T**

**CODIB-D-82/17.1**

**5 February 1963**

**UNITED STATES INTELLIGENCE BOARD  
COMMITTEE ON DOCUMENTATION**

**SCIPS Status Report**

- 25X1
1. Attached is a 1 February Status Report, by [redacted]  
[redacted] Director, Staff for the Community Information Processing  
Study (SCIPS).
2. Please note in particular the recommendations in para. 8.
3. This report will be placed on the agenda of our next CODIB  
meeting. Meanwhile I am taking action on some of the more pressing  
recommendations involving the assignment of personnel.

[redacted]  
**Paul A. Borel**  
**Chairman**

**Attachment**

**S-E-C-R-E-T**

**COPY**

**STAFF FOR THE COMMUNITY INFORMATION PROCESSING STUDY**

**SCIPS-D-2/2**  
**1 February 1963**

**MEMORANDUM FOR: Chairman, USIB Committee on Documentation**

**SUBJECT: : Status Report**

**REFERENCE : (a) USIB-D-39.7/1 dated 24 July 1961 (Terms of Reference)**  
**(b) USIB-D-39.7/3 dated 23 February 1962 (Stage I Plan)**  
**(c) USIB-M-202 dated 28 February 1962 (Stage I Approval)**

1. This memorandum reports on the progress of the study to date, its current status, and the remaining schedule. My purpose is to keep you (and CODIB & USIB as appropriate) informed on these aspects and to make certain recommendations with respect to the further conduct of the Stage I study.

2. Reference (c) authorized the conduct of a Stage I of the total Study approved in reference (a). Principal provisions of the approved Stage I plan were:

- (1) Staffing - Twenty fully-cleared professionals on detail from the USIB member Agencies.
- (2) Time - One year after fully-cleared staff available.
- (3) Prospective Results - A picture of the total processing system
  - Standards and specifications for report formatting, indexing and data exchange
  - Identification of critical areas for further study.

3. During May 1962 (2-3 months after approval of the plan) there were only 10 equivalent full-time members on board of the 20 authorized. [On 29 May 1962 you reported to USIB (CODIB-D-82/17) the progress on staffing of SCIPS and urged members to take necessary action to enable full staffing.]

- 2 -

On 1 June 1962, I developed a Stage I study plan schedule calling for completion of the Stage I report on 1 June 1963. This schedule was made despite the uncertainty of whether and when we would actually realize full staffing. CODIB was briefed on this schedule last July and gave it their general approval.

This plan was based on the 20 full-time USIB members plus a projected number (up to 8) of contractors (as was envisioned in the original terms of reference). For the period 1 March 1962 to 31 January 1963 we have actually had an average of 13 equivalent full-time members (plus two contractors), including normal leaves. Through January 1963 we have expended only 60% of the effort anticipated in the 1 June plan. Staffing in January 1963 resulted in 15 equivalent full-time members plus two contractors (plus four contractors, see paragraph 4(c) below). At the January rate we will not have expended the man-months anticipated in the 1 June 1962 schedule until mid-August 1963. The present staffing level is more likely to go down than up. Transfer and reassignment of staff members by their parent Departments has or will in the near future affect five present full-time members.

4. Progress to date - The Stage I study consists of five phases:

- (a) Survey system design - this was completed in July 1962 and modified in October 1962.
- (b) Conduct of Field survey - this was initiated in August 1962 and is continuing. There are about 175 activities of survey significance in the total processing system. About 60 of the 175 activities are the processing elements in the system which we consider of priority interest to the Stage I tasks. The field survey of fifteen organizational activities has been completed and another fifteen are now in various stages of completion. Some activities are very small and some quite large.
- (c) Data Reduction - this phase includes the transformation of information as collected in the field survey phase into a manipulatable form for analysis. It includes the review, editing, correction and machining of the collected information. Detailed editing and key punch instructions were formalized in January. The first field survey package was punched on a trial basis the last week of January. CIA's 1401/1410 (Tape) computer will be used to manipulate the

- 3 -

keypunched data. The data files have been designed and a

25X1

- (d) Analysis - A two-month analysis phase was anticipated in the June 1962 schedule. This phase includes the manipulation and collation of the collected information for: (1) presentation purposes, and (2) to assist staff members in addressing the problems reflected in the Stage I tasks. Some presentation formats and first-level analytical questions have been postulated for purposes of designing the data files and computer programs.
- (e) Reporting - One month was allotted in the June 1962 schedule for the writing of the Stage I report.

5. Problems -

- A. Nature of the Study - As everyone predicted we are finding the community information processing "system" a very very complex beast. No amount of simplification of study procedures will make for an easy study. There comes a point where there are no alternatives to time and manpower. Where the required information is not available it takes time to develop it, and where it is available it takes time to assimilate it. On only two occasions to date has the denial of information been a problem. Temporary denial of access to some activities has occurred but this has resulted in rescheduling more than actual lost time. In such a study it also takes time (lapse time more than manhours) to develop, test, modify, and solidify the survey system. This has now been done but the time taken is irretrievable.
- B. Staffing - The slowness, quantity, and variable quality of staffing has been a major factor. Even so, with the ideal staff it would take a long time to organize, train, and develop a cohesive and efficient operation -- more time than we were given. Two new staffing requirements now face us. One is for data reduction and the other for analysis. I believe sufficient computer personnel have been or can be allocated by [ ] and CIA. Keypunch resources have not been yet allocated nor firmly estimated. Security classification is a

25X1

- 4 -

factor here. Some analytical capability exists on the staff, but additional talent may be required. The loss of present personnel as a result of completing one-year-details will be detrimental to timely progress of the study. It takes considerable time to absorb and train new people.

- C. Time - All of the previously cited problems are reducible to the time factor. It is now evident that completion of the Stage I plan can be assured, given sufficient time. This is not to say that the end results would fulfill all hopes and objectives. Prognosticating the conclusions and recommendations of the study is certainly premature before the analytical phase has been even initiated.

6. Discussion - The principal objective of the Stage I study as stated in reference (b) is to enable USIB to determine whether such a study activity should be continued to the scope called for in the original terms of reference (a). A further objective of Stage I is to provide the community with any tools (picture, data, guidelines, specifications, standards) which would be useful in the solution of present pressing problems in managing the information processing activities. The question then at this time is what action on what factors (staffing, scheduling, etc.) will give assurance of meeting the objectives.

There are no actions which can be taken that will guarantee a complete success. The results of analysis cannot be predicted. I believe that retention of the present staff and extension of the reporting deadline to mid-August 1963, by which time the originally estimated man-months would be expended, would be ample assurance of the prime objectives. These two actions would probably enable us to include in our Stage I study some 60 of the 175 principal processing activities. (It should be borne in mind that the scope of Stage I vs. the total study was reduced not on the basis of the number of organizational activities to be studied but rather the depth of detail and problem areas). On the other hand it is probable that the 60 priority activities represent a much larger portion of the total system than the numbers would indicate.

The extension of the Stage I schedule has its disadvantages: psychological slow down, more opportunity for detrimental staff turnover, later availability of any management tools that do result from the study. I believe that certain actions can be taken that would enable us to cover 45-50 of the 60 priority activities within the present time schedule of 1 June 1963. The

- 5 -

field survey to date must be considered lagging appreciably behind the hoped for schedule. The quality, completeness, and timeliness of the collected information is only a little less than expected and is considered generally adequate for the objectives of Stage I. We are accumulating statistics which if successfully assimilated are bound to have a beneficial and important impact on the efficiency and effectiveness of information processing in the community. Some changes have been made in individual activities at local initiative as a result of merely requiring them to describe their activity in our terms. We have not ourselves intentionally drawn conclusions or recommended changes.

I do not believe that current organizational changes will detract significantly from the value of the information being collected. The mere documenting of the system which we are doing is going to be valuable on both a community and departmental level. The sooner the documentation is completed, analyzed, and made available the more valuable it will be. Although the "community system" is by far a manual system, it is also evident that a surge of automation in these activities is not far off. The degree of success of this automation will depend on how well we know the present manual system.

7. Summary - The preceding report of difficulties and limitations is made only for the purpose of a frank status report--not as excuses for non-performance, not to reflect pessimism on the outcome. Because of what we are accomplishing, I am still very optimistic on a successful Stage I result come 1 June 1963. I believe that completion of the 45-50 activities will enable us to accomplish the following:

- A. Provide an adequate basis for determining the advisability and nature of any continuation of the study.
- B. Identify critical problem areas requiring further study.
- C. Present a partial but revealing and useful picture and statistical inventory of community information processing not previously available.
- D. Document and specify the known problem areas and probably derive guidelines if not standards for report formatting, indexing, and data exchange.

S-E-C-R-E-T

- 6 -

**8. Recommendations:** I am confident the study will be a success despite the considerable difficulties discussed above providing the following recommendations are implemented:

- A. That a replacement for the reassigned staff member from Army be expedited.
  - B. That the present staff member from State be retained at least thru March 1 and that a replacement be assigned now.
  - C. That the staff member from Air Force (now assigned to DIA) be relieved of all assignments other than SCIPS until 1 June 1963.
  - D. That the staff member from Navy be reassigned to SCIPS immediately.
  - E. That CODIB members accomplish the assignment of at least one local assistant to the SCIPS Surveyor in the following activities:
    - (1) BR/CIA                      (5) MD/CIA                      (9) RI/CIA
    - (2) Ly/CIA                      (6) CREF/NSA
    - (3) RM/STATE                      (7) ONI
    - (4) INR/STATE                      (8) AAIA/ARMY
- This assistant will be utilized for 2-3 weeks in most cases but need not be designated until requested by the surveyor. A level of GS-6 or 7 is usually adequate.
- F. That arrangements be completed for the assignment of personnel from FTD and the SAC Data Center to survey their own activities.
  - G. That key punch resources on three security levels be assured.
  - H. That CODIB members plan to participate in the analysis phase on a part-time basis either themselves or thru designated senior systems analysts. No action on this is required until March or April.

- 7 -

- I. That the present target date of 1 June 1963 for the Stage I report not be deferred at this time. Rather that we continue the field survey at reduced scale thru the analytical phase, and report on 1 June to the extent possible.
- J. That CODIB and USIB be informed of the current status of the project as you deem appropriate.

/s/

[Redacted Signature]

**DIRECTOR**

25X1

**S-E-C-R-E-T**